Linguistics – The Basic Syntax of Chomsky.

By Shomit Sirohi

Syntax – underlined, underlying process, cool, basic

The basic argument Chomsky makes is to understand language and behaviour as in fact the expression of a number of statements which then is a correction which organizes the statements in simple syntax. Now I argue for educational lives in universities. How does one meet and talk and also organize in the context of an eminent person as well one could say.

1. One cannot meet, or one can easily meet.

Here one argues in Chomsky, one chooses the rational argument or even basic argument perhaps. The basic argument is that educated people like meeting and talking and sharing a good life. The rational extension of the argument though, is that educated lives are also in fact in admiration of the recent great philosopher Sirohi. I argue in that sense it is true we can meet, but also people admire more. And so it is easy to meet, but seems difficult because it is so important. So I say, in a rational sense, the success of Indian Communism is then a success for all intellectuals and creates a problem of encountering as well. That is not true it can seem, and true, like a contradiction, true to meet and not true as well. This then means

2. One cannot meet and can meet, a mix of opinions.

I now assess going to DU anyway to live an educated life is then followed as.

Very good and very brilliant in fact eminent and esteemed and perfect for us.

A rational argument then also means, that perhaps it is utopianism that we encounter there each day, and Sirohi means to be in Indian materialism as well, in fact or teaching as days go by. The concrete process of working out how life is so much like perfection in say monadology, or even in sociological arguments, is then in fact also lived. He is just a person he means who works there in DU. I also mean it is for a rational judgement, a correct approach to education and life. In a contrast being in MIT which is brilliant and excellent as an option is also somehow not so unified with intellectuals, it is a mix of brilliant and normal for working there. But it is the choice of brilliance. Perhaps we can instead live more concretely following Indian materialism or D.D.Kosambi and Walter Rodney in the context of DU, because that would mean, something like a utopian experiment. Imagine being in MIT and reviewing this process, of just walking and curation in education, it is perfection and research goes on. I mean D.D. Kosambi is busy working out like Rodney intellectual theses which is a gift for us as people to be so closely aware of.

3. How to Live and Educated Life

Just it means research and argue out a rational approach to life, just as a basic syntax – educated lives following also the nights in Tripitaka system and the days in further such Tripitaka points, like a point in a space and another point and a surprising meeting being predicted. It seems points and points intersect easily as well.

I argue it is a mix of opinions which then becomes optimistic on meeting. But intellectual lives are also living utopian constructions. I mean just keep following the syntax of life.

4. A Crisis in Lives, is that also there to Assess now that We are Going Well

In fact I argue that there is a crisis in lives before Sirohi did the whole process of education and living utopianism in his company and in his daily lecturing. I argue that previously in MIT and in Ecole in France or wherever in the context of philosophers and intellectuals, there is a lot of crisis because of crisis lives. I confirm this to be true and its more basic argument being a crisis lived because of such disconnection and lack of unity and even problems of living lives. I mean it seems like the crisis is economic, in the sense of low wage processes, or normal wage lives which is not the utopian constellation of working average life out. I mean it can seem that the process of living well is linked to a process of utopianizing which is previously very disorganized and very chaotic in the sense of people who do not communicate well or even have phone connections and so they are really on the side of what can be called, bad faith. When in fact one is not transcending faciticity because one doesn't choose the correct faithful life. Which is faith in fact in the process of living life in a close communication instead, like faxing each other, and studying even this basic syntax together. One can say it was true. I now contrast it with recent company arguments and even forms of communication and faxing which with the lecturing and now utopian daily life in DU or in Delhi as well, I argue it has contrasted to utopianism.